

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Final Office Action dated August 9, 2007, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on November 9, 2007. Applicants submit this response to place the application in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-26 are pending in the application. Claims 1-7, 12-16 and 22-26 remain pending following entry of this response. Claims 7 and 16 have been amended. Claims 8-11 and 17-21 have been cancelled. Applicants submit that the amendments and new claims do not introduce new matter. In particular, Applicants point out that claims 7 and 16 have been amended to include limitation from respective dependent claims, and all other claims depending from the amended independent claims have been cancelled. Accordingly, the amendments to claims 7 and 16 do not require further search or consideration (as they have been previously examined), and should be entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Yuknewicz et al.* (U.S. patent application publication No. 2005/0171934 A1, hereinafter *Yuknewicz*).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9

USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

In this case, *Yuknewicz* does not disclose “each and every element as set forth in the claim”. For example, *Yuknewicz* does not disclose “*identify one or more of the parameterized queries only if each field, specified as required in one or more parameterized query associations corresponding to the identified parameterized queries, are contained in the result set,*” as recited in claim 1. Independent claims 7, 16 and 22 include similar limitations.

Regarding this element, the Examiner argues in *Final Office Action*, p.10:

Yuknewicz teaches selecting a parameterized query by selecting the query from a drop down menu. The drop down menu allows the user to select the query based on the input field the user would like to search the database with. For example the user selects from the drop down menu "Fill by Zip Code". The user is then given a parameterized query that allows entry of a Zip Code. When the query is executed the "Zip Code field is part of the "result set" (see figure 7). Therefore *Yuknewicz* does teach identifying the query based on a one or more field found in the result set.

Here, the Examiner is asserting that a user selection of a menu item that includes a field name (“Fill by Zip Code”) teaches the limitation that the query is identified “*only if each field, specified as required ... are contained in the result set.*” However, Applicants respectfully submit that *Yuknewicz* does not disclose that the menu items in the drop down menu shown in Figure 7 are limited based on fields contained in a result set. Rather, *Yuknewicz* paragraph [0049] states “The queries listed in drop down menu 520 may be determined by searching a schema metadata file.” As far as the example given by the Examiner in which the user makes a menu selection, *Yuknewicz* does not disclose that the user selection is limited based on fields contained in a result set. Accordingly, neither the initial inclusion of menu items in the drop-down menu, nor the user selection of a menu item, discloses the recited limitation.

Generally, *Yuknewicz* teaches that parameterized queries may be associated to datasets, for instance datasets 222a-222c shown in Figure 2. For example, *Yuknewicz*, paragraph [0067] states “The identified set of existing queries is associated with the dataset selected at step 1110.” In *Yuknewicz*, paragraph [0039], a dataset is described as “a data table or a list” that is included in data source 220. That is, in *Yuknewicz*, parameterized queries are associated to stored data tables of a database. In contrast, the present claims recite identifying parameterized queries based on fields of query results. Further, *Yuknewicz* does not disclose that the fields of the query results must be “specified as required,” as recited in claims 1, 7, 16, and 22. In fact, *Yuknewicz* does not describe any limitations for fields of results sets that are required by parameterized query associations. Therefore, *Yuknewicz* does not disclose identification of one or more parameterized queries only if all required fields are included in a result set.

With reference to claim 12, the Examiner argues that *Yuknewicz* discloses analyzing a results set presented to identify parameterized queries associated with fields contained therein at paragraph [0048]. However, the cited passage is in fact directed to a menu which enables the user to select the dataset in which the parameterized query is to be executed. The fields of the user-selected dataset are not analyzed. Therefore, *Yuknewicz* could not disclose identification of one or more parameterized queries based on fields in a result set.

Yuknewicz does not disclose “each and every element as set forth in the claim”. In particular, *Yuknewicz* does not disclose identify one or more parameterized queries associated with fields in a result set. Thus, independent claims 1, 7, 12, 16, and 22, are not anticipated.

Therefore, independent claims 1, 7, 12, 16, and 22, and their dependents, are believed to be allowable, and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

If the Examiner believes any issues remain that prevent this application from going to issue, the Examiner is strongly encouraged to contact Gero McClellan, attorney of record, at (336) 643-3065, to discuss strategies for moving prosecution forward toward allowance.

Respectfully submitted, and
S-signed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.4,

/Gero G. McClellan, Reg. No. 44,227/

Gero G. McClellan
Registration No. 44,227
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicants